Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations | 1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2007-12

Moral support, strategic reasoning, or domestic politics America's continual support for Israel

Williams, Keith R.

Monterey California. Naval Postgraduate School

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/3028

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun

http://www.nps.edu/library

Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

MORAL SUPPORT, STRATEGIC REASONING, OR DOMESTIC POLITICS: AMERICA'S CONTINUAL SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

by

Keith R. Williams

December 2007

Thesis Co-Advisors: James Wirtz
Michael E Freeman

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY ***(Leave blank)***	**2. REPORT DATE** December 2007	**3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED** Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Moral Support, Strategic Reasoning, or Domestic Politics: America's Continual Support for Israel		**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**	
6. AUTHOR(S) Keith R. Williams			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE**	

13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)

Since Israel came into existence in 1948, the relationship between Washington and Tel Aviv has been unique and controversial. The conventional wisdom suggests that the relationship between the United States and Israel is driven by moral affinities and strategic reasoning. In March 2006, John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt suggested that Jewish interest groups and their persuasive tactics are the only reasons for continued U.S. support to Israel. This thesis described the different factors that promote close U.S.-Israel relations and identifies a competing explanation for U.S. support for Israel based on evangelical ideology.

14. SUBJECT TERMS Moral arguments for U.S. support to Israel, Strategic arguments for U.S. support to Israel, Arguments regarding the Jewish "Israel Lobby," The evangelical argument.			**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 75
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified	**20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UU

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

MORAL SUPPORT, STRATEGIC REASONING, OR DOMESTIC POLITICS: AMERICA'S CONTINUAL SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Keith R. Williams
Captain, United States Army
B.S., Liberty University, 2003

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2007

Author: Keith R. Williams

Approved by: James Wirtz
Co-Advisor

Michael E. Freeman
Co-Advisor

Douglas Porch
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

Since Israel came into existence in 1948, the relationship between Washington and Tel Aviv has been unique and controversial. The conventional wisdom suggests that the relationship between the United States and Israel is driven by moral affinities and strategic reasoning. In March 2006, John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt suggested that Jewish interest groups and their persuasive tactics are the only reasons for continued U.S. support to Israel. This thesis described the different factors that promote close U.S.-Israel relations and identifies a competing explanation for U.S. support for Israel based on evangelical ideology.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION....1

II. MORAL ARGUMENTS FOR U.S. SUPPORT TO ISRAEL....7
- A. MEARSHEIMER AND WALT'S ARGUMENTS....7
- B. AMERICA'S RESPONSE BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENTS OF THE HOLOCAUST....9
- C. THE ROLE ANIT-SEMITISM PLAYED IN AMERICA BEFORE AND AFTER THE HOLOCAUST....12
- D. THE MEMORY OF THE HOLOCAUST IN AMERICA....14

III. STRATEGIC ARGUMENTS FOR U.S. SUPPORT TO ISRAEL....19
- A. OVERVIEW OF U.S.-ISRAEL STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP....20
- B. UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL: DO THEY SHARE THE SAME ENEMY....26
- C. ISRAEL: A RELIABLE ALLY OR NOT....28

IV. ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE JEWISH "ISRAEL LOBBY"....31
- A. WHAT IS AIPAC?....32
- B. MEARSHEIMER AND WALT'S ARGUMENTS....35

V. THE EVANGELICAL ARGUMENT....41
- A. OVERVIEW OF EVANGELICALS....41
- B. EVANGELICAL REASONING FOR SUPPORTING ISRAEL....44
- C. PAST INFLUENCES AND SUCCESSES....48

VI. CONCLUSION....53
- A. MORAL ARGUMENT....53
- B. STRATEGIC ARGUMENT....54
- C. THE JEWISH "ISRAEL LOBBY"....54
- D. THE EVANGELICAL ARGUMENTS....55

LIST OF REFERENCES....57

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST....61

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Moral Arguments for U.S. support to Israel 18
Figure 2. Strategic arguments for U.S. support to Israel 30
Figure 3. Arguments involving the Jewish “Israel Lobby” w/ focus on AIPAC 40

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the following individuals for their support and assistance during the work of this thesis: First, to my beautiful wife, Tameka, who patiently endured what seemed to be endless hours of research. Second, I wish to thank my advisors, Professors James Wirtz and Michael Freeman, who took time from their schedules to give me scholarly guidance and transform my thoughts into an intellectual framework. Third, I would like to recognize and thank the soldiers who served under my command in Iraq. Without your support and dedication to duty, I would have never had the chance to write this thesis. Lastly, I would like to thank my Heavenly Father, who has bestowed his many blessings upon my life.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

For the last fifty nine years, the United States has been aiding and ensuring the quality of life in Israel by financially supporting this Jewish state. When America first initiated support for Israel, there were moral reasons that drove U.S. support which mainly stemmed from the atrocities that occurred during the Holocaust. Over time, however, the moral reasoning for this support supposedly transitioned into strategic and political logic. In March 2006, John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt suggested that Jewish interest groups and their persuasive tactics are the only reasons for continued U.S. support to Israel. This thesis identifies a different explanation for U.S. support for Israel, which is based on the idea that support for Israel is relatively widespread in the American body politic and that elected officials are aware that support for Israel will be rewarded at election time.

This thesis assesses several explanations for U.S. support to Israel. An evaluation of these competing arguments is important because some scholars contend that support for Israel is not in the U.S. national interest and can only result in trouble for the United States. Others suggest, however, that support for Israel is in the U.S. national interest and that any withdrawal of support for Israel would be disastrous for U.S. national security. This thesis explores the overall importance of Israel in U.S. foreign policy and whether or not support for Israel is in the U.S. national interest.

The "Israel Lobby" and its effect on U.S. foreign policy are topics of great concern for many Americans. Since Israel became an independent state in 1948, Washington formed not only a great friendship, but also an alliance with Tel Aviv based on common democratic values, religious affinities, and security interests.[1] Since World War II, Israel has consistently been the largest cumulative recipient of United States foreign assistance.[2] Jewish interest groups, also known as the "Israel Lobby," were formed to help ensure America's support for Israel would remain strong. Recently,

[1] Carol Migdalovitz, *Israel: Background and Relations with the United States*, (CRS- The Library of Congress, November 14, 2006) 1.

[2] Jeremy Sharp, *US Foreign Aid to Israel*, (CRS Report for Congress. January 5, 2006). 1.

Mearsheimer and Walt have questioned the justification of U.S. support for Israel, in light of these lobbying techniques, and the legitimacy of U.S. financial assistance to Israel.

There are three arguments about the strength of U.S. support for Israel: those who see it based on moral reasons; those who see it as primarily based on rational calculations of strategic interest; and those who see it as primarily based on domestic politics and the effectiveness of the Israel Lobby. Those who embrace a moral argument believe that there are obvious moral justifications for why the United States should have initially supported Israel and why the United States continues to support Israel today. For these observers, the Holocaust, in which 6 million Jews were killed, justifies support to Israel. Even though Mearsheimer and Walt hold that the moral reasons for Israeli support have dwindled, those who embrace the moral argument believe that support from America is still important because Israel continues to suffer consistent harassment and attacks from its neighbors.

The strategic argument recognizes the Israel Lobby's impact on foreign policy, but argues that the Lobby does not represent an overriding influence, and that there are numerous strategic factors that sustain U.S. support for Israel.[3] The strategic argument offers an extensive list of reasons for U.S. support, which not only serve Israeli interests but also the overall U.S. national interests.[4] The Israel Lobby actually promotes this moral and strategic logic to further Israeli support; however, critics suggest that the lobby is driven more by Israel's strategic interest than by the interests of the United States.

The "domestic politics" argument suggests that the moral and strategic rationales for unconditional support to Israel have diminished over the last 60 years, and that there remains little justification for U.S. support given Israel's self-sufficient military capabilities.[5] Therefore, the explanation for continued support lies largely with the Israel

---

[3]Stephen Zunes, "The Israel Lobby: How Powerful is it Really*?"* (*FPIF*, 2006); Nadav Safran, *Israel The Embattled Ally*. Cambridge, (MA: Harvard University Press. 1978); John K. Cooley, *An Alliance Against Babylon, The US, Israel, and Iraq*, (Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press. 2005); Abraham Ben-ZVI, *Lyndon B. Johnson and the Polotics of Arms Sales to Israel*, (Portland, OR: Frank Class. 2004); Zeev Maoz, *Defending the Holy Land*, (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press. 2006).

[4] Carol Migdalovitz, *Israel: Background and Relations with the United States*, (CRS Report for Congress).

[5] John J. Mearsheimer, Stephen M. Walt, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy," (*London Review of Books*, March 2006.); Camille Mansour, *Beyond Alliace, Israel in US Foreign Policy*. (NY: Columbia University Press. 1994).

Lobby's effective lobbying of the U.S. Congress and the executive branch, which ultimately shapes the public's sympathetic attitude towards Israel.[6] This argument suggests that continued high levels of U.S. support to Israel do not further the national interest and the continued influence of the Israel Lobby will inevitably and unnecessarily encourage additional wars and deter peace.[7] Those who highlight the strength of the Israel Lobby believe that the U.S. government should resist the influence of the Lobby and that the United States should sharply reduce its support to Israel.

Those who embrace the strategic and moral arguments for supporting Israel accept that the "Israel Lobby" does have some impact on U.S. support for Israel; however, they believe that the Lobby is not the over riding reason for continued support to Israel. The debate about whether Jewish interest groups, national strategic, or moral interests drive U.S. support for Israel, however, fails to consider the role of other pro-Israel constituencies. Americans who are not Jewish might actually favor U.S. moral or financial support to Tel Aviv. This thesis addresses this issue by examining the role of Evangelical Christians, a major contributor and supporter of U.S. support to Israel. This thesis suggests that as long as Christian communities in the United States remain a strong supporter of Israel and pro-Israel organizations, America will most likely continue to provide support for Israel. Support for Israel is openly suggested in the dogma of many Christian groups and is a theme that runs through the belief system of the Evangelical Christian society and in Catholic theology, which sometimes alludes to Christianity as a Jewish "sect." The evangelicals believe Israeli support must continue to fulfill certain prophetic claims made in the Bible. Although there is some discrepancy among different evangelical denominations, the majority of evangelicals agree that Israel's presence is a prelude to the second coming of Christ. This thesis demonstrates that the evangelical Christian support for Israel is a sufficient condition for American support to Israel.

To understand and determine how evangelical Christians greatly influence the overall U.S. support for Israel, this thesis identifies the existence and reasoning behind this alternate driving force promoting U.S. support to Israel. The dependent variable

[6]Mearsheimer, 16.

[7] Ibid.

(DV) will be represented by the overall outcome of U.S. support for Israel as a state. There are two possible outcomes for support to Israel, which consist of continual steady support or decreasing support. The independent variable (IV) will be the level of support from the Evangelical Christian movement for Israel. Aside from the other variables that lead to Israeli support, this thesis suggests that if all other independent variables disappeared, the new variable identified would be sufficient for continuing U.S. support to Israel.

(IV)		(DV)
Evangelical Christians support for Israel	→	U.S. support for Israel as a state

To test the causal relationship between the independent and dependant variables, this thesis will demonstrate that the Christian Evangelicals attitudes toward Israel is a sufficient condition for continual U.S. support for Israel. To accomplish this task, this thesis first describes the moral, strategic, domestic, and "Christian" arguments for supporting Israel and then test these competing hypotheses against the historical record to identify which explanation can best account for events.

Although the so-called "Israel Lobby" articulates strong support for Israel and helps to shape U.S. foreign policy, it is not a necessary condition for U.S. support to Israel. Necessary causation implies that there would be no support for Israel without the "Lobby." This thesis will not attempt to disprove Mearsheimer and Walt's argument which would be to say that Jewish interest groups have no influence; this thesis is suggesting that their argument is only a sufficient condition for U.S. support. To simply suggest the "Israel lobby" as the only logic behind U.S. support to Israel is the same as implying that the only reason for the continuation of Social Security is due to the American Association for Retired Persons (AARP). Just as the AARP is a focal point for supporters of social security, so too is the "Israel Lobby" only a focal point for U.S. supporters of Israel. If Mearsheimer and Walt are correct in their reasoning of Jewish interest groups being a so called "super power," then the Lobby alone should drive U.S.

support, regardless of what anyone else thinks about the issue. By contrast, this thesis identifies additional non-Jewish organizations that support Israel that are not affiliated to the Lobby. Showing additional non-Jewish organizations that strongly support Israel will further demonstrates that Jewish interest groups are not an over-riding influence for U.S. support.

The Holocaust, no doubt, left an everlasting scar on the Jewish and American populations. This thesis will discover whether the United States has maintained, decreased, or totally diminished its moral support to the Jewish people living in Israel. Because this is a difficult task to accomplish, this thesis first assesses Mearsheimer and Walt's arguments and then conduct an in-depth analysis of the holocaust with the hope of discovering whether there is sufficient data to support the moral justification for U.S. support to Israel.

The "strategic" argument maintains that Israel is and has been a strategic asset to the United States and that this strategic justification is a necessary and sufficient condition for U.S. support. To estimate the "strategic" argument's causation for U.S. support, this thesis will analyze whether Israel is a current strategic asset or liability for America. To measure the strategic impact, this thesis weighs the benefits and negative aspects of past events and decides whether Israel, as a strategic asset, has increased or decreased over the last 50 years. This thesis explores whether Israel's strategic benefits to the United States are on the decline or are an overriding reason for maintaining U.S. support.

The "domestic politics" argument is the primary reason offered by Mearsheimer and Walt for explaining U.S. support for Israel. Their arguments will be assessed through an in-depth analysis of Jewish interest groups and their impact on Congress and U.S. foreign policy. This thesis assesses whether or not Mearsheimer and Walt's argument is a necessary condition for U.S. continued support for Israel.

This thesis analyses three areas to demonstrate that the Evangelical Christian attitude toward Israel is a sufficient condition for U.S. support to Tel Aviv. The first area of study will review the historical background of the Evangelical Christians in American society. Next, this thesis describes the primary motivations behind evangelical's

unconditional support for Israel with specific focus on religious ideologies. Finally, this thesis estimates the past influence and over all success of American evangelicals and estimates if they alone are sufficient for continued U.S. support to Israel.

This thesis suggests that a strong presence of evangelicals in America also is a sufficient source of support for U.S. support for Israel. By defining the relationship between religion and government and showing its impact on governmental decision making, one can see how the support of evangelical Christians is potentially a sufficient condition for U.S. support to Israel. After the analysis of evangelical Christians in relation to Israeli support is accomplished, the conclusion of this thesis addresses the overall findings of the different aspects explaining U.S. support for Israel.

II. MORAL ARGUMENTS FOR U.S. SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

In the beginning of Mearsheimer and Walt's "Israel Lobby" article, they argue against the conventional view held by most Americans that the United States has a moral obligation to Israel. Mearsheimer and Walt claim that the moral case for supporting Israel is "dwindling" and that the conventional wisdom is no longer applicable. According to Mearsheimer and Walt, the conventional wisdom regarding the moral case for supporting Israel, consists of four beliefs: "1) It is weak and surrounded by enemies, 2) it is a democracy, which is a morally preferable form of government; 3) the Jewish people have suffered from past crimes and therefore deserve special treatment, and 4) Israel's conduct has been morally superior to its adversaries' behavior."[8] According to Mearsheimer and Walt, the four conventional reasons no longer justify moral reasoning for U.S. support to Israel. In order to determine whether arguments from Mearsheimer and Walt or the conventional wisdom are sufficient, this chapter describes Mearsheimer and Walt's four arguments and demonstrates that three out of four arguments are correct in the way they are presented. The one argument in question is whether or not the events of the Holocaust are the driving force behind America's moral support for Israel (See *Table 1*). To better decide if in fact the Holocaust is sufficient for continued moral support to Israel, this chapter will review: A) Mearsheimer and Walt's arguments; B) America's response before and during the occurrences of the Holocaust; C) the role anti-Semitism played in America before and during the Holocaust; and D) the memory of the Holocaust in America.

A. MEARSHEIMER AND WALT'S ARGUMENTS

Mearsheimer and Walt do not believe that Israel is a weak state surrounded by enemies. Their position is for the most part accurate, but not beyond qualification. It is difficult to dispute that Israel has grown into one of the most militarily powerful states in the Middle East. What can be disputed about Mearsheimer and Walt's view is whether

[8] Mearsheimer, 8-13.

Israel is surrounded by enemies. If one is looking through a conventional lens at the nation state level then Mearsheimer and Walt's argument is true because states such as Egypt, Jordan and Turkey are not "anti-Israel" in the same way they were in the 1950s and 1960s. In fact, some of these surrounding states have assisted Israel in past peace agreements with Palestine. Where Mearsheimer and Walt go wrong, however, is in their failure to acknowledge the significance of non-state actors such as Hezbollah and Hamas, which reside in the surrounding states of Israel. Many non-state actors or "terrorist groups" that surround Israel currently deny Israel's existence and want nothing less than to wipe the Jewish state off the face of the earth. Today, these unconventional threats fuel Israel's drive to maintain military supremacy. Israel is militarily strong, but it also is surrounded by numerous threats of serious, if not existential, severity.

The second argument disputed by Mearsheimer and Walt is that because Israel is a fellow democracy, the United States should support Tel Aviv.[9] Mearsheimer and Walt claim that the democratic obligation for U.S. support "sounds convincing, but it cannot account for the current level of U.S. support because there are many democracies around the world that do not receive the same level of support that Israel receives."[10] They also argue that American and Israeli concepts of democracy are different in that Israel was founded primarily for Jews and America "is a place for any race, religion, or ethnicity."[11] Mearsheimer and Walt are correct to note that democracy alone cannot explain U.S. support for Israel. Other democracies around the world rarely receive even a fraction of the aid that the United States gives to Israel each year. The idea that U.S. support for Israel is based solely on democratic "affinity" cannot explain the high levels of U.S. aid to Israel.

Mearsheimer and Walt also disagree with the argument that past crimes against European Jewry require the United States to support to Israel. Mearsheimer and Walt do agree that the "past crimes against the Jews" fully justify Israel's existence, however; in their view it does not justify the continued high levels of U.S. support. Because the path

[9] Mearsheimer, 9.

[10] Ibid., 9.

[11] Ibid., 9.

to what Israel is today took many Palestinian lives and living space, Mearsheimer and Walt contend that Israel's past actions against Palestine do not deserve the continued high levels of financial backing from the United States.[12] By contrast, others believe that the Holocaust creates a moral obligation to support Israel.

Mearsheimer and Walt dispute the fourth conventional argument for supporting Israel- that "Israel's conduct has been morally superior to its adversaries' behavior" is losing credibility.[13] Mearsheimer and Walt's primary argument is that during the times of conflict between Israel and Palestine, Israel killed many Palestinians, including both militants and innocent civilian bystanders.[14] This argument is true; however, in any major conflict, civilian casualties are inevitable, especially on the weaker side. Hence, if one is basing moral superiority on the amount of civilian casualties then the Palestinians would be morally superior.

Mearsheimer and Walt's brief analysis against the conventional wisdom regarding U.S. moral support for Israel is not completely wrong, however; it does seem that they purposely chose a few particular aspects of Israel's foreign and defense policy that highlights the darker side of Israeli behavior. A similarly damning, but more plausible case could be made against the devious actions of Palestinian militants towards Israel.

One plausible way to discover if America had or currently has a moral obligation to support Israel requires an analysis of American actions before, during, and after the Holocaust. Because the Holocaust was such a profound event, this analysis will explore if the actions of America during and after the Holocaust were enough to initialize and sustain a moral obligation to Israel. If the answer is yes, the analysis will explore if a moral obligation continues or has decreased over time.

B. AMERICA'S RESPONSE BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENTS OF THE HOLOCAUST

World War II and the Holocaust affected the lives of millions of people in both Europe and America. Although it is not perfectly clear as to when Adolf Hitler made the

[12] Mearsheimer, 11.

[13] Ibid., 8.

[14] Ibid., 12.

decision to destroy completely the Jews of Europe, some suggest his intentions were clear in 1933, the date which "marked the beginning of the tragedy of European Jewry."[15] Both Hitler's rise to power and his deadly intentions are important stories, however; this study highlights American views about immigration, U.S. officials' knowledge of the Holocaust, and America's rescue effort towards the victims of the Holocaust.

"Until the Nazis blocked the exits in the fall of 1941," according to David Wyman, "the oppressed Jews of Europe might have fled to safety. But relatively few got out, mainly because the rest of the world would not take them in."[16] In the 1930s, there was a refugee crisis among European Jews who could not gain entry into America.[17] From 1933 to 1941, there was an anti-immigration mentality residing in America, which was enforced by groups with extensive political power. Organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and American Legion acquired millions of members including hundreds of congressmen and strongly encouraged decision makers to stop all immigration.[18] Much of their reasoning stemmed from unemployment issues in America, however in some cases the reasoning was for "American nativism."[19] Some scholarship suggests that "American nativism" strongly insinuated anti-Semitism. Prior to the attacks on Pearl Harbor, the majority of America did not want to allow Jewish refugees into the country. According to Wyman, "In 1938, a year when the Nazis had sharply stepped up their persecution of Jews, four separate polls indicated that from 71 to 85 percent of the American public opposed increasing the quotas to help refugees."[20] American opinion toward refugees was immensely clear when it came to the persecution of European Jews. America's anti-immigration mentality during the thirties and early

[15] Leonard Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust (*Columbia University Press: New York,1982): 1.

[16] David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews* (Pantheo Books: New York 1984): 5.

[17] Ibid.,6.

[18] Ibid., 7.

[19] Ibid., 7.

[20] Wyman, 8.

forties can be excused if it was simply intended to reduce unemployment. It would not be understandable, however, if Americans had knew of Hitler's mass killings and still would not assist Jewish refugees.

In the early 1940s, America was overwhelmingly pre-occupied with the course of the war.[21] Nevertheless, the American media did have knowledge of the Holocaust and printed numerous stories covering the shocking numbers of murders perpetrated by the Nazi regime. Prior to the reported mass killings, Hitler's discriminatory actions such as the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 and Kristallnacht in 1938 were extensively reported in the American media.[22] Even if Hitler's intentions were not clear enough for Americans, the first reporting of the mass killings occurred as early as 1939 and more so throughout the early forties.[23] These reports were, however, considered contradictory among the American populous. According to Peter Novick, "in the nature of the situation, there were no first hand reports from Western journalists; rather, they came from a handful of Jews who had escaped, from underground sources, from anonymous German informants, and perhaps most unreliable of all, from the Soviet government."[24] In addition, many of the American stories that reported the mass killings were disbelieved because of the many inaccurate stories about atrocities that emerged during WWI.[25]Even though many predominant newspapers such as the *New York Times* and the *Boston Globe* reported stories of the mass killing during the Holocaust, the majority of America remained in denial because millions of Jews being collectively annihilated was simply beyond belief.[26] Once Americans finally realized that mass murder of Jews was taking place, however, their rescue attempts to save the European Jews was insufficient at best due to political obstacles and anti-Semitic concerns.

As more news began to flood the American media, the more sympathetic America became towards the Jews who were rapidly disappearing across Europe. Jewish

---

[21] Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Houghton Mifflin Company: New York 2000): 20.

[22] Kenneth S. Davis, *FDR: Into the Storm* (New York 1993): 366.

[23] Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret* (Henry Holt and Company: New York 1998): 93.

[24] Novick, 22.

[25] Wyman, 27.

[26] Novick, 25.

organizations, Christian churches, and government officials were now publicly speaking out against the massacres and expressing collective sympathy for the European Jews.[27] By July 1942, it was reported that more that 1 million Jews had been murdered in Eastern Europe.[28] Even though this number still seemed unbelievable to some Americans, many were now speaking out and pressuring the government for a rescue operation. Many foreign countries also were urging President Roosevelt to act against the Nazi atrocities. By mid-1942, according to Wyman, "nine occupied European countries urged President Roosevelt to retaliate for the atrocities."[29] Following State Department Advice, however, Roosevelt rejected the appeal to become directly involved in a military operation specifically to save the Jews.[30] By 1943 and 1944, public interest was rapidly rising but resolutions toward involvement were not succeeding. Samuel Rosenman, who was special council to the President, advised against a Jewish rescue operations because it could possible increase anti-Semitism in America.[31] Aside from the President and his administration, Capital Hill also did very little to assist the European Jews. "Except for a weak and insignificant resolution condemning Nazi mass murder," according to Wyman, "Congress took no official action concerning the Holocaust."[32] By 1945, many rescue opportunities which could have been made did not occur as millions of European Jews were slaughtered by an Nazi regime.

C. THE ROLE ANIT-SEMITISM PLAYED IN AMERICA BEFORE AND AFTER THE HOLOCAUST

According to Roberto Finzi, "The Christ-Killing of which the Jews have stood accused for centuries is not merely a distant and abstract theological idea."[33] This idea is one which has stood firm throughout the history of Europe and was seen as a motivator

[27] Wyman, 26.

[28] Laqueur, 72.

[29] Wyman, 29.

[30] Ibid., 29.

[31] Ibid., 316.

[32] Ibid., 316.

[33] Roberto Finzi, *Anti-Semitism: from its European roots to the Holocaust* (Interlink Publishing Group: New York 1999): 13.

that initiated the massacre of almost six million Jews. Although Hitler's anti-Semitic intentions were not perfectly clear in the beginning of his reign, it is now widely accepted that anti-Semitism was a fundamental inspiration behind the Nazi Regime. Long before the events of the Holocaust, anti-Semitism also existed throughout American culture. The core beliefs of anti-Semitism not only found its way among the original laws of America, it was also openly practiced among key figures and throughout American history. "As a juridically Christian country," notes Finzi, "the thirteen original states had laws-limiting the rights of Jews to vote and hold public office" which were not repealed until the early 1860's.[34] By the 1870s, anti-Semitism became even more customary in that many Jews were denied access to public facilities all over the East Coast.[35] In addition to the denial of public access, certain Americans went so far as to publish writings focusing on the Jewish international conspiracy. Similar writings were already quite common among Europeans by the 1880s. "According to a magazine called '*The Anti-Bolshevik*," according to Finzi, "the United States had entered the First World War in 1917 as a result of the secret machinations of the Jews."[36] In the 1920s, ideas such as these were widely accepted by such a prominent figure as Henry Ford. Ford eventually acquired the "*Dearborn Independent*" which was a weekly newspaper that occasionally published stories with strong anecdotes of anti-Semitism.[37] The "*Dearborn Independent*" sold thousands of copies, which were widely distributed among the American public. Many of these articles were used as Nazi propaganda during World War II. Henry Ford was one of many important American figures that stood out against the Jews. There were many religious figures, intellectuals, and politicians that condemned anti-Semitism; however, that condemnation was not enough to encourage America, as a whole, to assist the European Jews during the Holocaust.

---

[34] Roberto Finzi, *Anti-Semitism: from its European roots to the Holocaust* (Interlink Publishing Group: New York 1999): 71.

[35] Ibid., 72.

[36] Ibid., 74.

[37] Ibid., 74.

During World War II, anti-Semitism in America was steadily on the rise and reached its peak in 1944 when the European Jews were in desperate need of assistance.[38] Throughout America, according to Finzi, "Jewish cemeteries were vandalized, synagogues were damaged as well as defaced with swastikas and anti-Semitic slogans, anti-Jewish markings were scrawled on sidewalks and Jewish stores."[39] Aside from the vandalism, there were also many U.S. opinion polls which focused on America's perception of the Jews during the War years. These particular polls covered the time period between 1938 and 1946. According to Finzi, "The results indicated that over half the American population perceived Jews as greedy and dishonest and that… 35 to 40 percent of the population was prepared to approve an anti-Jewish campaign."[40] Attitudes such as these complicated American involvement during the Holocaust. Wyman believes that a "truly concerned leadership in the government and in the Christian churches could have turned that potential into a powerful influence for effective action."[41] Either way, the actions or better yet, non-actions from America to assist the European Jews was affected by anti-Semitism. There were people who did strongly oppose anti-Semitism. Launching a large rescue operation solely for the Jews, however, was not a popular idea among the American public due to the negative affects of anti-Semitism.

D. THE MEMORY OF THE HOLOCAUST IN AMERICA

America's actions during the Holocaust will forever be remembered in American history. When Hitler was finally defeated, however, the previously skeptical beliefs about Jewish mass murder were portrayed by the remaining torture chambers and surviving victims. In the midst of this "eye opening experience," America's prior anti-Semitic views quickly diminished and transformed into an overwhelming moral support for the Jewish victims. America's quick transformation in support for the Jews is best understood in light of its relative inaction in response to the Holocaust. These actions and the fact that Jewish victims needed a home was more than enough reason for America to

[38] Wyman, 9.

[39] Wyman, 10.

[40] Ibid., 14-15.

[41] Wyman 15.

support the Jews and Israel's initial existence. Although the occurrences of the Holocaust brought justification to Israel's initial existence, it was not originally the theme that tied the Holocaust to overwhelming financial support to Israel. Whether it was denial or simply early shock, America did not adhere to any major remembrance of the Holocaust until the mid 1960s.[42] As anti-Semitism decreased in America, the Jews were, however, finally able to be recognized as American citizens. According to Wyman, "This transformation fundamentally changed the way Jews and Judaism were perceived in America. Judaism became an American religion… and moved into the mainstream of American life."[43] As American Jews established there way into "mainstream America" throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, Israel and its relationship to the Holocaust was getting very little recognition. It wasn't until 1967 and the escalating crisis in the Middle East that brought Americans began to identify Israel with the past memories of the Holocaust.[44] With Israel's neighbors making claims to "wipe Israel off the map" and "drive the Jews into the sea" reawakened Americas' past memories of World War II atrocities and intensified a new wave of support for Israel.[45]

These shifts in America's view towards Israel and past memories of the Holocaust were enhanced by key events to include the Eichmann trial, the Six-Day War, and popular cultural influences, which contributed to the remembrance of the Holocaust and support for Israel.[46] The Eichmann trail was one event that undoubtedly produced a growing awareness of the Holocaust memory for not only America but the world as well. Although the facts of the Holocaust were always available to the public, the Eichmann trail reiterated specific realities of the tormented Jews during the Holocaust.[47] "For many Americans, Jews and non-Jews alike," according to Wyman, "the trial, which was reported and broadcast around the world, was the first time they grasped the full story of

---

[42] Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (University of Washington Press: Seattle and London 2001): 6.

[43] Ibid., 6.

[44] Novick, 148.

[45] Ibid., 148.

[46] Mintz, 10.

[47] Ibid., 11.

the murder of European Jewry."[48] The Eichmann trial not only initiated a new awareness of the Holocaust, it also increased sympathy for the state of Israel.

In 1967, six years after the Eichmann trial, Israel's existence was threatened by neighboring Arab countries with what is know as the "Six-Day War." Israel ended up victorious with minimal casualties and control over more territory, which included control of the Gaza strip, Sinai Peninsula, the West Bank, and the Golden Heights. Even though Israel was victorious, Israel's quest for independence and safety in the face of the Arab aggression reawakened the possibility and awareness that most of the remaining Jewish population could potentially be destroyed.[49] This awareness was accepted by America and even more so by American Jews.

With the story of the Holocaust retold during the Eichmann trial and the existential threat to Israel's existence created by the Six-Day War, America discovered even new ways to show sympathy and remember the events of the Holocaust. Even though the trial and the wars involving Israel created a link between the Holocaust of the past and a potential Holocaust of the future, the phenomenon that brought even more awareness to the American public was the Holocaust presented in a new cultural fashion. This new form of cultural influence was presented in books, movies, plays, and television series. Although there were many popular remembrances of the Holocaust, one of the main influences that caught the attention of America was "The Diary of Anne Frank." Although the diary was not initially popular in its first publishing, it did have a significant impact on America as Israel began to progress as a nation. According to Mintz, "The power of the diary laid in its ability to do what no political event had done: to create a bridge of empathic connection, even identification, between the fate of European Jewry and ordinary American readers."[50] In addition to the Diary, popular television series and movies began to air, for instance, the 1978 television miniseries about the Holocaust which was viewed by 120 million Americans, and the 1993 film, "Schindler's List." To increase even more awareness among young people, "Schindler's List" was distributed

[48] Mintz, 10.

[49] Mintz, 15.

[50] Ibid., 17.

free of charge to high schools, libraries, and other educational institutions across the United States.[51] As televisions series, books, and movies of the Holocaust were presented from the 1970s through the 1990s, the climax of American sympathy was reflected by the opening of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1993. “At a time when federal funding for arts and culture was being slashed, the museum saw its appropriations redoubled by Congress; Holocaust remembrance,” according to Mintz, “was held as a point of moral consensus between” all sides of America.[52]

In conclusion, even though there are many reasons for U.S. support to Israel the moral responsibility or obligation that many Americas feel toward Israel was clearly initiated by a lackadaisical response to the persecution of European Jewry, especially in the 1930s. Once the realities of the Holocaust were undeniably displayed to America, anti-Semitism and racism were transformed into feelings of sympathy toward Israel. Although Mearsheimer and Walt acknowledge that the Holocaust was the initial basis for U.S. support to Israel, they failed to acknowledge the impact that the Holocaust truly had on America. As the American horror over the Holocaust increased, support for Israel followed. The belief that the United States has a moral obligation to support Israel, however, alone is not entirely sufficient in explaining America’s continuing support to the Jewish state.

[51] Mintz 35.

[52] Mintz, 33.

	Conventional Wisdom (CW)	**Mearsheimer and Walt (M&W)**	**Argument analyisis/ Ch. 2**
Moral Arguments for U.S. support to Israel	1) Israel is a weak state surrounded by enemies	Disagree w/CW- Israel is not weak anymore.	Agree w/M&W
	2) Israel is a democracy which is a preferable form of government	Disagree w/CW- Many other democracies, not similar to U.S.	Agree w/M&W
	3) The impact of the Holocaust promotes a moral obligation to Israel	Agree w/CW- Holocaust initiated moral support Disagree w/CW- Holocaust did not sustain moral support	Agree w/M&W Disagree w/M&W- Events of Holocaust initiated and sustained moral obligation from U.S.
	4) Israel's conduct is morally superior than its adversaries' behavior	Disagree w/CW- Israel is not morally superior: they've kill more civilians	Agree w/M&W

Figure 1. Moral Arguments for U.S. support to Israel

III. STRATEGIC ARGUMENTS FOR U.S. SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt question the current strategic value of Israel to the United States. They contend that Israel has, over the years, proven to be useless as a strategic asset to the United States. They question Israel's current strategic capabilities and its role as a strategic asset. In regards to Israel past utility as a strategic asset, Mearsheimer and Walt state that even if Israel was a strategic asset during the Cold War Tel Aviv no longer has much to offer to the United States.[53] Their assessment reflects an inadequate reading of Israel as a strategic asset to the United States.

Mearsheimer and Walt also question the idea that Israel and the United States do not share the same enemies. They claim that "terrorism is a tactic employed by a wide array of political groups; it is not a single unified advisory. The terrorist organizations that threaten Israel (e.g., Hamas or Hezbollah) do not threaten the United States."[54] There is evidence to suggest, however, that Iran is the critical actor behind Hamas and Hezbollah, and that these terrorist organizations act in concert with nation-states opposed to U.S. interests.

Mearsheimer and Walt also view Israel as a strategic burden because they believe that America's overwhelming support to Israel only encourages terrorist behavior. They assert that the large sums of financial aid given to Israel promote a potential arms race in the Middle East and that "Israel's nuclear arsenal…is why some of its neighbors want nuclear weapons."[55] In addition, Mearsheimer and Walt point out that many foreign elites, including those of the British government, are opposed to America's relationship to Israel and believe that the "special relationship" between Washington and Tel Aviv only handicaps the war on terror and any possibility of peace in the region.[56] Mearsheimer and Walt are probably correct in their assertion that U.S. support to Israel

[53] Mearsheimer, 4.

[54] Ibid., 5.

[55] Ibid., 6.

[56] Ibid., 6.

exacerbates terrorism; or at least it is impossible to say for sure if they are correct in the absence of a clear disengagement between Washington and Tel Aviv. Additionally, Mearsheimer and Walt also assert that Israel does not act like a loyal Ally. In their view, Israel has taken actions that could have possibly put the United States in jeopardy. Mearsheimer and Walt point out that Israel's espionage effort against the United States and its failure to comply with U.S. request are not the actions of a reliable ally.

To address these issues raised by Mearsheimer and Walt, this chapter describes Israel's history as a strategic asset to the United States. In turn, this overview of Israel's past behavior can be used to estimate its current value as a U.S. ally. The second section addresses the broader intentions of "Radical Islam," exploring if interconnections exist among Islamic fundamentalists that link U.S. and Israeli opponents together, or if those groups act independently of each other. The argument that claims that Israel is not a loyal ally is addressed in the final section of this chapter by assessing the performance of Israel as a U.S. ally. The strategic arguments are outlined in *Figure 2*.

A. OVERVIEW OF U.S.-ISRAEL STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP

The strategic relationship between the United States and Israel can be divided into five different periods: First stage (1948-1957), second stage (1957-1967), third stage (1967-1973), fourth stage (1973-1975) and fifth stage (1975-Present). During the First Stage from 1948 to 1957, Israel was more of a liability than a reliable strategic asset. The American moral obligation to Israel initially undermined the emerging U.S. policy toward the Middle East. America's interest in the Middle East was its strategic location vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. If America could pull Arab nations into the Western defense system, the U.S. military could use the Middle East as a possible staging area to counter Soviet threats. But the U.S. moral interest in Israel stood in the way of better relations with Arabs.[57] As time went on, according to Nadav Safran, "Nasser and the Soviets used the American sympathy and support for Israel as a weapon to embrace the United States' Arab friends and to frustrate its alliance plans."[58] The competing goals of supporting

[57] Safran, 578.

[58] Safran, 579.

Israel and using the Middle East to help offset the Soviet threat created a fundamental dilemma that would complicate U.S.-Israeli relations.

During the second stage from 1957 to 1967, the United States was unable to bring particular Arab countries into its defense system. But because the advances in long-range delivery systems allowed the United States to base the bulk of its strategic nuclear in the Continental United States, the use of Arab states as a staging ground for the U.S. nuclear deterrent became less crucial. As a result of these changes, America began to look beyond the moral obligation to Israel and assess its strategic value. Even though Israel's strategic value became more apparent, President Eisenhower would still not agree to arms sales to Israel, which Tel Aviv consistently requested.[59] As Israel became more desperate for arms, they began to search outside the United States and eventually found an ally in France, who became Israel's main weapons supplier. It was not until the John F. Kennedy administration that the United States began to respond to Israel's security needs as well as a potential U.S. strategic outlook for the future. According to Safran, "President Kennedy tentatively but explicitly referred to balance of power as a guiding principle of American Middle East policy, publicly allowing for the first time for a strategic role for Israel in the context of American Policy."[60] As Egypt adopted a more aggressive posture following its involvement in the Yemen War, the United States contained Egypt by selling even more weapons to Israel. The turning point of America's strategic involvement with Israel came in 1967.

Between 1967 and 1975, the United States became more closely linked to Israel, especially following Tel Aviv's victory during the "Six Day War." Israel's strategic importance was now clearly evidenced by the amount of U.S. aid given to the country, which increased by 450% compared to previous years.[61] In 1968, the Lyndon B. Johnson administration provided Phantom fighter-bombers to Israel in response to Soviet arms sales to Egypt and Syria. When Richard Nixon came into office, he was initially hesitant to support Israel. He soon came to realize according to Safran, that "it was necessary to

---

[59] Mordechai Gazit, "The Genesis of the US-Israeli Military-Strategic Relationship and the Dimona Issue." *Journal of Contemporary History* (2000): 413.

[60] Safran, 581.

[61] Zunes, 5.

maintain Israeli military superiority to deter war and deny the Arabs and the Soviets the alternative of recovering the territories by force."[62] In the early 1970s, the Soviet Union was still aggressively seeking to sell arms to their clients in the Middle East. Henry Kissinger, who was an advisor to President Nixon, convinced the president to continue military aid to Israel to counter these efforts. In addition, Israel's successful effort in saving King Hussein's regime during the Jordanian Civil War strongly influenced the President's decision to continue military support for Israel. As a result of the Jordanian episode, Israel was able to deter future military initiatives by Egypt which further contributed to the expulsion of Soviet advisors from Egypt.[63]

The Yom Kippur War surprised both America and Israel during the fourth stage, which lasted from 1973 to 1975. During this time period, the United States was openly providing massive amounts of arms to Israel in the hope of deterring an Arab invasion of the Jewish state. According to Safran, "Contrary to expectations, the Arabs were not deterred from going to war, Israel did not win quickly and easily, and the Soviet Union… did not stay out of the conflict."[64] The Yom Kippur War now put the future of U.S.-Israeli relations in limbo. Kissinger, who was Secretary of State at the time of the conlfict, attempted to use the war to America's advantage and encourage Israel to advance a settlement of the entire Arab-Israeli conflict.[65] The new American desire for a settlement did not sit well with Israel. But because Israel was still very dependent on the United States for military aid, they were willing to pursue various avenues towards a settlement. These efforts consisted of six different attempts to reach an agreement between Israel and its neighbors: (1) The Six Point Agreement (November 1973); (2) The Egyptian-Israeli Disengagement Agreement (January 1974); (3) The Syrian-Israeli Disengagement Agreement (May 1974); (4) Negotiations for a Jordanian-Israeli Disengagement (June-October 1974); (5) A Second Egyptian-Israeli Agreement (February - March 1975); and (6) The Second Sinai Agreement (September 1975). All

[62] Safran, 584.

[63] Ibid., 587.

[64] Ibid., 588.

[65] Safran, 588.

except the fourth and fifth attempts to reach an agreement were successful. These two agreements failed because of the different positions adopted by Israel and the United States. At times, Israel's resistance caused the United States to withhold arms and economic aid to Israel.[66]

Because Israel's military capabilities failed to deter the Arabs in 1973, President Carter, who came into office in 1977, gave top priority to a peace settlement between Israel and its neighbors. This peace settlement is remembered as the Camp David Treaty between Egypt and Israel. The Camp David meetings included thirteen days of tense negotiations between Egyptian President Anwar Al Sadat, Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, and President Carter. On September 17, 1978, an agreement was reached whereby Israel had to withdraw its forces from Sinai. In return, Egypt agreed to carry out normal diplomatic relations with Israel and limit the number of troops they stationed in the Sinai.[67] The peace treaty ultimately led to the assassination of President Anwar Sadat. Additionally, many Israeli citizens were expelled from their homes. As a reward for the peace agreement, the United States increased annual aid to both countries. Egypt received 1.3 billion per year and Israel 3 billion per year.[68]

The fifth stage in the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship is from 1975 to the present. Although the Carter administration was more concerned with Middle East peace than cultivating Israel as a strategic asset, the Reagan administration attempted to reassure Israel's strategic importance in the Middle Eastern region. The reassurance was initiated with a signed agreement between Israel and the United States to improve strategic cooperation and military planning.[69] Some benefits of the agreement included joint military exercises, more Israeli access to weapon systems, and free trade with America. As these benefits were being delivered, Israel began to show signs of becoming a strategic burden rather than a strategic asset. Israel used U.S. weapons to attack Lebanon. In 1985, Jonathan Pollard sold classified U.S. documents to Israel. In response to Israel's

---

[66] Safran, 592.

[67] "Jimmy Carter online library" http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.org/documents/campdavid/. Last date accessed, October/2007.

[68] "U.S. Department of State" www.state.gov. Last accessed, August/2007.

[69] U.S. Department of State" www.state.gov. Last accessed, August/2007.

illegal use of American weapons, according to Cloud, "the Reagan Administration imposed a six-year ban on further sales of cluster weapons to Israel."[70] Although the strategic relations between the United States and Israel became troubled, the Reagan administration was pro-Israel.

When the George H.W. Bush administration came into office, Israel was initially troubled about future U.S-Israel relations, especially because of statements made by James Baker and disagreements over particular Palestinian issues. James Baker, who at the time was Secretary of State, informed the American Israel Public Affairs Committee that Israel should abandon its expansionist policies and "lay aside a vision of greater Israel."[71] In 1989, there were ongoing disagreements involving the Palestinian Peace conference. In 1990, Israeli police killed 17 Palestinians. Eventually U.S.-Israel tensions diminished when Israel faced serious threats from Iraq. As Israel became a target of Iraqi SCUD missiles during the First Gulf War, America made a commitment to guarantee its security and requested that Israel not retaliate with military force. Israel complied with U.S. requests which further improved their relations. By contrast, Mearsheimer and Walt suggest in their article that Israel was becoming a strategic liability during the First Gulf War. Their reasoning was that "the U.S. could not use Israeli bases during the war without rupturing the anti-Iraq coalition, and it had to divert resources to keep Tel Aviv from doing anything that might fracture the alliance against Saddam."[72] This may be true; however, Mearsheimer and Walt failed to consider other areas where Israel did provide strategic support during the Gulf War. Israel contributed to the fight by developing air-to-ground tactics utilized by the United States and by providing conformal fuel tanks for F-15 Fighter jets which enhanced flying ranges. In addition Israel provided mine plows, mobile bridges, and helicopter targeting devises, which were all used by U.S. forces throughout the War.[73] Israel may not have contributed directly to the fight; however, they were able to supply the United States with pertinent military technology

[70] David S. Cloud, "Inquiry opened into Israeli use of U.S. bombs," *New York Times* (Aug. 25, 2006).

[71] Ellen Fleischmann, "Image and Issues and the AIPAC Conference," *Journal of Palestine Studies* (1989): 84.

[72] Mearsheimer, 4.

[73] Zunes, 6.

and equipment to assist in operations. Mearsheimer and Walt also fail to acknowledge that the United States requested that Israeli forces refrain from engaging in combat operations.

During the Clinton administration, a significant turning point in history occurred with the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993 and the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel in 1994. The Oslo Accords required Israel to withdraw from parts of the Gaza strip and the West Bank and allowed the PLO governing rights within those areas. The following year, the Israel-Jordan peace treaty was signed in the Arava Valley of Israel. It was witnessed by President Clinton. This treaty was accepted by the United States, Egypt, and Jordan, but Syria and Hezbollah did not recognize any agreements within the treaty. Throughout the Clinton administration, U.S.-Israeli relations primarily focused on enabling peace, rather than blindly supporting Israel.

The George W. Bush administration's strategic relationship to Israel has changed, especially the attacks of 9-11. The attacks of 9-11 were the first overwhelmingly successful attack by radical Islam on U.S. soil. Israel, on the other hand, has suffered from the effects of Islamic terrorism since almost the beginning of its existence. With the occurrence of 9-11 and the War in Iraq, the Bush administration declared a War on Terror, which categorized all Islamic terrorists as those that threaten free democracies. Since Israel shares the same democratic freedoms as America, the two countries, according to the Bush administration, now shared the same threat posed by radical Islam. Mearsheimer and Walt again criticized Israel for not contributing to the War on Terror, arguing that Israelis do not actually fight against terror outside of their country. Israel's direct contribution to the overall War on Terror is limited. Mearsheimer and Walt, however, fail to consider the many indirect contributions Israel has made in the fight against terror: Israel has allowed the United States to pre-position military equipment to increase U.S. readiness, they helped train U.S. Special Forces in guerrilla warfare, and Israeli and U.S. officers have continually shared information on counter insurgency tactics.[74] Israel contributes to the fight against Islamic extremism, but often their contributions are kept under wraps.

[74] Zunes, 7.

Mearsheimer and Walt failed to give a proper historical account of Israel's past successes, which put Israel's strategic successes and capabilities into question in their analysis. Israel has not always been reliable; however, the majority of the times, their actions have been strategically beneficial to the United States.

B. UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL: DO THEY SHARE THE SAME ENEMY

Mearsheimer and Walt question the idea that Israel and the United States do not share the same enemies. They claim that "terrorism is a tactic employed by a wide array of political groups; it is not a single unified advisory. The terrorist organizations that threaten Israel (e.g., Hamas or Hezbollah) do not threaten the United States."[75] To distinguish whether the United States and Israel share the same enemy, this chapter will analyze the interconnectedness and strategic outlook of radical Islam by focusing on Iran and Hezbollah.

Iran is responsible for creating Hezbollah and has openly supported Hezbollah's terrorist activity against Israel. Iran also equips Hezbollah with Iranian weapon systems so that the group can fight Israel and their military forces.[76] As recently as 2006, according to Carol Migdalovitz, "Defense Minister Mofaz charged that Iran had financed a PIJ suicide bombing in Tel Aviv and Israeli officials blamed Iran for Hezbollah's attack on northern Israel in July 2006."[77] With the continued Iranian funding and support, Hezbollah also runs, according to Migdalovitz, many "social-services in Lebanon including schools, television channels, hospitals, and clinics, and also emerges as a major Lebanese political force."[78] Many of these social services openly promote anti-U.S. and Israel positions which include directing radical propaganda towards children.[79]

Although Iran openly funds and supports Hezbollah towards Israel, this fact still does not satisfy the claim that Israel and the United States share the same enemy. Even

---

[75]Mearsheimer, 5.

[76] Hezbollah. Reference.com. *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*. Columbia University Press. http://www.reference.com/browse/columbia/Hezbollah (accessed: August 08, 2007).

[77] Migdalovitz, 10.

[78] Migdalovitz, 10.

[79] Ibid

though Iran does support Hezbollah, it does not necessarily follow that Iran or Hezbollah are enemies of the United States. For Iran and Hezbollah to become enemies of the United States, they would have to openly engage the United States or U.S. forces with their own personnel or equipment. As a veteran of the Iraqi war, I personally was on the receiving end of many different types of enemy weapon systems in Iraq. The military intelligence section that was attached to my unit confirmed in 2005 that the most deadly weapon system used against U.S. forces in Iraq was made in Iran. This highly sophisticated weapon system is known as the Explosive Forming Projectile (EFP) which can penetrate most military armored materials and according to Fox news, "accounts for a third of combat deaths suffered by coalition forces."[80] In 2006, the U.S. military discovered three factories in Iran that were mass producing EFPs and sending them across the border to kill coalition forces in Iraq.[81] In addition, Iranian rockets deployed east of Baghdad have recently been spotted firing at U.S troops. A video, made by Iraqi insurgents, was captured in a military raid on August 6, 2007 and it clearly shows 107mm Iranian made rocket systems firing at U.S. troops.[82] According to Harnden, "The U.S. has repeatedly claimed that it has evidence Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard is smuggling these weapons into Iraq."[83] Because thousands of Iranian weapons are being used to attack U.S. forces in Baghdad, it is easy to see that Iran is an enemy to the United States.

In March, 2007, U.S. military forces captured an individual named Ali Musa Daqduq in Iraq, who initially pretended to be a deaf-mute; however, after many interrogations he eventually offered some rather interesting information. As Daqduq, began to talk, U.S. forces discovered that he was an operative from Hezbollah sent to Iraq to train Shi'ite militia fighters in skilled guerrilla warfare.[84] Daqduq joined Hezbollah in 1983 and moved into high leadership quite rapidly. In 2005, he was sent to Iran to train for his future job in Iraq with the primary purpose to kill U.S. and Coalition forces.

---

[80] "Captured Video Shows Iraqi Insurgents Fireing Sophisticated Iranian-Made Rockets at U.S. position," http//www.foxnews.com; internet; accessed August 8, 2007.

[81] Toby Harnden, "Three Iranian Factories Mass-Produce Bombs to Kill British In Iraq," *London Sunday Telegraph* (August 20, 2006): 1.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] Mark Kukis, "Hezbollah's long reach into Iraq," *Time Magazine*, July 24, 2007, 1.

Daqduq's capture undeniably proves that Hezbollah and Iran are interconnected and are both a threat and enemy to U.S. forces. Hence, the United States and Israel do indeed share some of the same threats and enemies.

C. ISRAEL: A RELIABLE ALLY OR NOT

Mearsheimer and Walt question Israel's reliability as a U.S. ally. Overall, Mearsheimer and Walt identify four points that suggest that Israel is a poor ally: (1) ignoring of U.S. requests to refrain from settlement construction and targeted assassination, (2) Israel provision of sensitive information to China, (3) the case of Jonathan Pollard spy case: and (4) a 2004 incident in which a Pentagon official passed classified information to Israeli diplomat.[85] These negative acts without a doubt brought Israel's reliability into question; however, because Israel also has offered so many benefits as a strategic ally, it is difficult to place Israel in the same category as other countries that are not allied with the United States.

Israel offers the United States several strategic benefits. First, Israel is located in the Middle East. According to Camille Mansour, "the use of Israeli territory as a site for propositioning military equipment allows an American intervention force to face contingency involving simultaneously the Persian Gulf and NATO."[86] Second, Israel offers infrastructure and logistics support. Because Israel, for the most part, uses the same type of weapons as the United States, their facilities provide maintenance capabilities and staging areas for American forces and equipment. Third, Israel offers defense and intervention capabilities. For defense abilities, according to Mansour, "Israel's domination of the air and its ability to protect its own air space can shield any American intervention force that might use Israeli facilities."[87] For intervention purposes, Israel has repeatedly shown their capabilities with the Six Day War in 1967, their direct contributions in saving King Hussein's regime from a Syrian invasion, and their past successes in quickly reacting to terrorist attacks from neighboring countries. The fourth

[85] Mearsheimer, 6.

[86] Camille Mansour, *Beyond Alliance: Israel in U.S. foreign* Policy (Columbia University Press: New York 1994): 2.

[87] Mansour, 5.

reason why Israel provides strategic benefits to the United States is its capabilites in research, experimentation, and intelligence. Israel's battlefield experience allows it to test American military equipment while making refinements and suggestions that further ensures the reliability of combat technology for America. In regards to intelligence, Israeli military forces come from many different areas in the region which give them better knowledge of Middle Eastern languages, mentality and other necessary factors which can contribute to U.S. forces, which lack such integral expertise in the region.[88]

Israel offers the United States many strategic benefits that contribute more than enough to label the country as a reliable ally. Israelis have, at times, conducted themselves in ways that do not appear as loyal. Because Israel overwhelmingly offers more benefits than burdens as an ally, however, they will continue to be a strategic asset to the United States.

Mearsheimer and Walt's overall assessment of the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship consisted of four major arguments. First, they brought into question Israel's past strategic capabilities by failing to recognize the many accomplishments of Israel's strategic value. In response to their argument, this chapter provided a positive description of Israel's past strategic relationship and capabilities with the United States. This overview showed that Mearsheimer and Walt's assessment of Israel's past contribution to U.S. interests was inaccurate and that the U.S. relationship with Israel was beneficial to the United States. Mearsheimer and Walt also stated that the United States and Israel do not share the same enemy. This argument also was proven incorrect by showing the interconnectedness of Iran and Hezbollah and how they are both contributing to the fight against U.S. forces in Iraq. Mearsheimer and Walt's third argument stated that U.S. relations with Israel only promote terrorist activity. This argument could not be disputed in that as long as Israel exists, Palestinian terrorism will most likely continue. Hezbollah continues not to recognize Israel as a legitimate state. Therefore, to say that U.S.-Israel relations only promote terrorism cannot be disputed. Mearsheimer and Walt also allege that Israel's espionage and failure to comply with U.S. requests do not reflect the actions

[88] Mansour, 7.

of a reliable ally. No U.S. ally, however, has ever been 100% reliable. Because Israel provides strategic benefits to the United States, it is difficult to sustain the argument that Israel is an unreliable ally.

	Conventional Wisdom (CW)	**Mearsheimer and Walt (M&W)**	**Argument analysis/ Chapter 3**
Strategic arguments for U.S. support to Israel	1) Israel is a strategic asset (both past and present)	Agree w/CW- Israel might have been an asset in the past Disagree w/CW- Israel is no longer a strategic asset	Agree w/CW- Israel was a strong asset in the past Disagree w/M&W- Israel is currently a strategic asset
	2) Israel and U.S. share the same enemy	Disagree w/CW- Israel and U.S. do not share the same enemy	Disagree w/M&W- Israel and U.S. do share the same enemy
	3) U.S.-Israel relations do not encourage terrorism	Disagree w/CW- U.S.-Israel relations do encourage terrorism	Agree w/M&W- U.S. Israel relations do encourage terrorism
	4) Israel is a loyal ally	Disagree w/CW- Israel is not a loyal ally	Disagree w/M&W- Israel is a loyal ally

Figure 2. Strategic arguments for U.S. support to Israel

IV. ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE JEWISH "ISRAEL LOBBY"

Although professors Mearshiemer and Walt suggested that there is a dwindling moral and strategic argument for U.S. support to Israel, the previous chapters' counter arguments showed that the moral and strategic arguments can still be made in regards to U.S.-Israel relations. There are still additional domestic actors, however, that have the ability to lobby the U.S. government on behalf of Israel. Unless additional actors are explored, it is difficult to assume that U.S.-Israel relations are solely based on moral and strategic reasoning. The domestic actor which could potentially explain the continuation of U.S.-Israel relations is known as the "Israel Lobby." Mearshiemer and Walt claim that the explanation for U.S. support to Israel "lies in the unmatched power to the Israel Lobby" and if it were "not for the Lobby's ability to manipulate the American political system, the relationship between Israel and the U.S. would be far less intimate."[89] Furthermore they define the core of the Lobby to be "compromised of American Jews who make a significant effort in their daily lives to bend U.S. foreign policy so that is advances Israel's interests."[90] Although there are many Jewish organizations that meet this definition, there is one particular organization which Mearshiemer and Walt believe stands out above the rest in that it is "the most powerful and well-known."[91] This particular organization is known as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee or AIPAC. Conventional wisdom, however, argues that U.S. support to Israel is explained by moral and strategic reasoning without the influences of the Israel Lobby. In addition, the conventional wisdom does recognize AIPAC as a powerful interest group which is influential towards U.S.-Israel relations. Yet it does not see AIPAC as all-powerful and the only driving force behind that relationship. To discover which arguments are sufficient, this chapter gives a brief overview of AIPAC and reviews a few of its influential methods. The chapter also examines Mearshiemer and Walt's arguments

[89] Mearsheimer, 14.

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid. 15.

regarding AIPAC by focusing on AIPAC's ability to influence Congress and the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel. (See Figure 3).

A. WHAT IS AIPAC?

When Israel finally became a state in 1948, it needed economic aid due to the influx of immigration that occurred during the first three years its existence. At this time in history, pro-Israel Jewish groups were becoming more organized in America. At the same time, Israel needed an organization that could directly influence Capitol Hill and fight for legislation that could directly influence aid to Israel. For any powerful organization to be successful, a leader was needed with governmental connections that could unite a Jewish front in directly influencing Congress to support Israel. The leader chosen for this difficult and challenging position was I.L. Kenen. In the 1950s, Kenen initially took the lead by running the American Zionist Council (AZC). The AZC was a tax-exempt organization which could not lobby the government on a full-time basis.[92] Because of this lobbying dilemma, AZC was eventually changed to AIPAC which enabled the organization to loose its "tax-exempt status." With this change, the newly formed AIPAC could now lobby the government without the prior lobbying restrictions they once had to abide by. The name AIPAC was officially adopted in 1959 and the organization was led by Kenen, the executive director, until 1974.

When AIPAC began, Kenen was the only registered lobbyist and the organization employed a staff of four."[93] Over the years, AIPAC has grown into a 100,000 member national grass roots movement."[94] This movement claims to be directly involved with over 100 legislative initiatives per year in order to strengthen the relationship between the United States and Israel. To support these initiatives to occur, AIPAC has a network of ten regional offices and nine satellite offices that work to obtain vital aid for Israel to help ensure Israel remains secure."[95] In addition to manpower, AIPAC has, over the years,

---

[92] Lee O'Brian, *American Jewish Organizations & Israel.* (Institue for Palestine Studies: Washington D.C. 1986): 158.

[93] Ibid. 160.

[94] AIPAC. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee. America's Pro-Israel Lobby. http://www.aipac.org/about_AIPAC/default.asp. Last accessed, October/2007.

[95] Ibid.

developed many effective tactics, which are consistently used on Capitol Hill, that can influence governmental decision making. Although the tactics of AIPAC can be quite sophisticated and complex at times, its primary goal is simple in that it attempts to persuade members of Congress to support Israel and deter any Congressional actions that oppose Israel. In order for AIPAC to accomplish this "simple" task, it has to employ many different levels of influence with Jews, non-Jews, academia, media outlets and most importantly the government.

One of AIPAC's most effective tactics is its ability to produce timely and accurate information to Congress. By conducting all the legwork for Congress, AIPAC can produce relevant legislation that benefits both AIPAC and Congress.

The Congressional Research Service notes:

> AIPAC and the other groups comprising the Israel lobby are as effective as they are in part because of the services they supply to members of Congress and their staffs. These principally involve the production of carefully crafted and packaged information, designed to be of maximum value to a busy legislator.[96]

To assist in the information process, AIPAC also is connected with many other Jewish organizations that can rapidly transmit important information or requests to aid in the immediate action required to benefit Congress. [97] Additionally, providing beneficial information allows AIPAC to gain time and access to Congressional offices, which only promotes a closer relationship between lobbyists and members of Congress. Once the legislation or even potential legislation is considered, AIPAC immediately informs its supporting community on all the congressional current affairs and additional information that promotes a pro-Israel agenda.

To update its Jewish and non-Jewish community, AIPAC has developed methods of information sharing that continuously updates and enables its supporters to become politically involved with numerous members of Congress. For this mobilization and influence to occur, AIPAC keeps its followers informed by sending out a steady supply

---

[96] Congressional Research Service. February 1982, 48.

[97] Ibid.

of reports, memos, speeches, analyses, and letters.[98] The content of these mailings consists of information about broad topical issues and Middle East- related analysis about legislation and voting patterns of all politicians.[99] These newsletters also are used to promote AIPAC events, which publish important speeches and testimonies regarding pro-Israel matters. One of the most popular subscriptions is called the "Near East Report," which is sent to the majority of AIPAC's supporters. All members of Congress also receive the Near East Report for free."[100]

AIPAC also keeps its followers informed and active by holding an annual policy conference. Each year, men and women who hold high ranking government positions, religious affiliations, and any followers who support Israel attend this conference held by AIPAC. In fact, the 2007 conference was attended by many important officials, including Vice President Dick Cheney, Hillary Clinton, and Barack Obama (and other 2008 presidential contenders). Former CIA director James Woolsey, Congressional leaders, and numerous officials from the State Department and White House also attended the event.[101] Many of these politicians gave lectures at the conference reassuring AIPAC members of their pro-Israel stance. Particular topics include foreign policy issues that threaten both the United States and Israel. In addition to the guest lectures, the conference also provides "lobbying labs," which are used to educate the attendants on how to influence Congress. These labs are set up to teach people on how to persuade their congressional representatives to adopt AIPAC policies.[102] Once the conference is completed, the lobbyists then hold meetings with their congressional representatives and discuss future legislation on pro-Israel agendas. At this year's conference, AIPACs members held over 500 meetings with almost every U.S. senator and more than half of the House of Representatives.[103] Although AIPACs annual conference and news letters

[98] O'Brian, 180.

[99] O'Brian, 181.

[100] Nancy Nelson, "The Zionist Organizational Structure." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Autumn 1980. 84.

[101] Gregory Levey, "Inside America's powerful Israel Lobby." *Salon Inc.* March 2007. 2.

[102] Ibid.

[103] Ibid.

are effective in promoting lobbying techniques and keeping people informed on Israeli issues, there are still many other procedures and resources employed by AIPAC that directly influence Congress on a day-to-day basis. Mearshiemer and Walt claim that some of these additional procedures are manipulating congressional decisions that can only point to a pro-Israel stance.

B. MEARSHEIMER AND WALT'S ARGUMENTS

As Mearsheimer and Walt began to make their case against the "Israel Lobby," the arguments initially seemed to be plausible when the focus was solely on the influential aspects of AIPAC. Because AIPAC primarily makes up the pro-Israel Lobby, arguments made about it manipulating congressional decision making, could possibly be sufficient to explain U.S. support to Israel. As Mearsheimer and Walt continued to make their case against AIPAC, however, they began to categorize anyone who supports Israel as a part of the Israel Lobby. By labeling anyone who supports Israel as a part of the Israel Lobby allows Mearsheimer and Walt's case to appear insufficient because not all people that support Israel agree with or want to be affiliated with AIPAC and other pro-Israel groups; hence, the reason one cannot group all Israeli supporters together. AIPAC by itself however, is potentially a sufficient reason for the continued U.S. support for Israel. Mearsheimer and Walt suggest that the AIPAC is all-powerful in two ways: 1) It controls Congress with its Jewish constituency involving votes, money, and attacking those with a negative Israel stance, and 2) it uses its influence to manipulate the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship.

The first argument offered by Mearsheimer and Walt is their assertion that the AIPAC manipulates Congress with its Jewish constituency involving votes, money, and attacking those who make negative comments against Israel. Claiming that the Jews manipulate congressional voting patterns is, at first glance, difficult to make in that the average Jewish population in congressional districts has always been less than 3 percent. Mearsheimer and Walt's reasoning for their assertion is that "Policymakers will tend to

accommodate those who care about the issue in question, even if their numbers are small, confident that the rest of the population will not penalize them."[104]

Before Mearsheimer and Walt wrote about this issue, there were other scholars who were concerned with the same issue of the Jewish influence in congressional voting. A few years ago A.F.K. Organski conducted a thorough case study with the hope of discovering the impact Jewish constituencies had on congressional voting patters. The case study covered a 13 year time period comparing the voting record of senators with large and small Jewish populations. The study was able to determine whether the two sets of senators behave differently with legislative matters regarding Israel in accordance to their Jewish constituency.[105] The study showed that the size of Jewish constituencies do in fact have a significant impact on congressional voting patters. The outcomes were as follows: "Senators with Jewish constituencies between 2 & 3 percent support pro-Israel positions 79 percent of the time, and those with constituencies larger than 3 percent support pro-Israel positions as frequently as 90 percent of the time and higher."[106] In short, even though Jewish constituencies are significantly small, the fact of the matter is that as Jewish populations increase, so too does the congressional voting in favor of issues that support Israel. Hence, Mearshiemer and Walt do seem to be correct in their reasoning that Jewish constituencies do impact congressional voting even if these constituencies are small.

Mearsheimer and Walt also argue that Jewish campaign contributions also manipulate congressional decision making. Organski also conducted a case study that measured the impact of Jewish money on congressional voting patterns. This study was conducted over a 5 year period and similar to the fist study, the results showed in favor of Mearsheimer and Walt's view point. The results were as follows: The senators were placed in 3 different groups. The first group consisted of 53 senators who receive 2 percent or less of their campaign contribution from Jewish sources, and these senators

---

[104] Mearsheimer 16.

[105] A.F. K. Organski, *The $36 Billion Bargain: Strategy and politics in U.S. assistance to Israel.* (Columbia University Press: New York1990): 65.

[106] Ibid. Organski did mention that even though the Jewish constituencies did impact voting, the study did not account for how many senators would vote for Israel despite the size of their Jewish population.

vote on average 51.5 percent in favor of pro-Israel positions. The second group consisted of 36 senators who receive between 2 & 5 percent of their money from Jewish sources and support in favor of Israel 76 percent of the time. Finally, the third group consisted of 41 senators who receive over 5 percent of their money from Jewish sources vote in favor of Israel between 83 and 93 percent of the time.[107] The study shows a "very strong association between levels of funding from Jewish sources and levels of senatorial support for Israel."[108]

Now that it has been shown that both the Jewish population and their money do have an affect on Congressional voting, the final part of the argument suggests that AIPAC demonizes those who make negative comments against Israel. Mearsheimer and Walt claim that when congressional figures seem hostile to Israel, AIPAC "will direct campaign contributions to their political opponents," conduct large letter writing campaigns, and use additional tactics that can sway political elections. Mearsheimer and Walt only used one example to prove their case which involved the defeat of Senator Charles Percy in 1984. Supposedly, a spokesman from AIPAC said, in regards to this case, that "All the Jews in America, from coast to coast, gathered to oust Percy. And the American politicians- those who hold public position now, and those who aspire- got the message."[109] This case may be true, but for Mearsheimer and Walt's argument to be convincing, additional cases must be shown. In the search to find these additional cases, it was surprising to find out that there were not many cases of this particular influence because political figures are too afraid to make negative comments in fear that the AIPAC could attack them. AIPAC realizes that not all congressional members are 100 percent pro-Israel. "For this reason, AIPAC staffers, together with supportive aides and representatives, constantly monitor events in Congress and all actions of

[107] Organski, 71-72. Even though there is a connection between Jewish money and congressional votes, Organski notes that… "The inference certainly is plausible, but the presence of an association does not indicate which factor is the cause and which the effect." He suggests that the Jewish money seems to go to those who have in the past already had a pro-Israel stance which suggest that the money may not fully account for the voting patterns. The money does, however, still have some affect.

[108] Ibid

[109] Mearsheimer, 17-18.

congressmen."[110] A congressional aide said that "It takes just one wishy-washy statement or letter to be picked up by AIPAC monitors and circulated to synagogues or community groups."[111] Because AIPAC is deeply involved in ensuring a pro-Israel stance among congressional figures, it is easy to see how Congressional members would be hesitant to take a negative stance toward Israel.

The second argument made by Mearsheimer and Walt is that the Lobby influences the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel. The two scholars state that AIPAC and the majority of the Jewish population were "key factors in shaping the decision for war" and that "without the lobby's efforts, the United States would have been far less likely to have gone to war in March 2003."[112] In addition to the Jewish influence in the Iraq War, Mearsheimer and Walt suggest that the Lobby will continue to use the United States to fight Israel's wars which involve eliminating additional countries that threaten Israel to include both Syria and Iran.

AIPAC's involvement in influencing America to target countries that threaten Israel comes at no surprise. It has already been shown that AIPAC is in fact influential in Congress and for AIPAC to lobby the United States on behave of Israel's security should be expected as well. Mearsheimer and Walt stated that AIPAC was quite involved in the events leading to the Iraq War and will most likely continue their involvement in areas that threaten Israel. The "Iraq war," however, was the only example used by Mearsheimer and Walt to prove AIPAC's "all-powerful" influence in strategic affairs. For AIPAC to be labeled "all-powerful," its influence would have to be present in more than one strategic area.

The majority of AIPAC's influence has been their ability to persuade Congress to increase foreign aid to Israel. This was especially true during the 1960s and 1970s. Although some of this aid was used to benefit the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship, in the 1980s, however, AIPAC's influence expanded outside foreign aid arenas and solely focused on strategic affairs. During this time period, AIPAC's strategic influence was

---

[110] O'Brian, 169.

[111] O'Brian, 176.

[112] Mearsheimer, 35.

evident in their ability to provide beneficial information in the form of memos and congressional briefings. In 1980s, when Soviet expansion threatened the Middle East, AIPAC wrote numerous memos selling the strategic benefits that Israel could offer the United States. For example, one particular AIPAC memo written in 1983 stated that Israel could offer "valuable naval assistance, available airfields and ports, storage sites for ammunition, fuel, and equipment, and hospitals" which could be of assistance in the event that American casualties occurred."[113] Not only did AIPAC provide strategic benefits for Israel, they also offered in-depth information on the Middle East. In an AIPAC promotional letter, Hon. Frank Church was quoted saying: "When I needed information on the Middle East, it was reassuring to know that I could depend on AIPAC for professional and reliable assistance."[114] Aside from providing information, AIPAC also sponsored strategic briefings to congressional members. According to Lee O'Brian, on 4 February 1983, AIPAC provided a specialist on Lebanon who briefed prominent members of Congress on why the Reagan peace plan was insufficient.[115] In addition, once the seminar concluded, the memos briefing notes were sent to every member of Congress.[116] One final area where AIPAC influenced the United States in strategic arenas occurred with their success in stopping the sale of AWACs to Saudi Arabia. In 1981, President Regan strongly encouraged the AWACs sale to help Saudi's defend their oil fields from possible Iranian attacks. According to Ball, "the sale had everything going for it-except AIPAC. Congressmen were bombarded by petitions and by anti-AWACs tracts written by AIPAC staffers."[117] In the end, AIPAC was successful by influencing Congress to turn down the sale with a vote of 301 to 111. In short, AIPAC has, in addition to the Iraq war, been influential in many areas involving strategic affairs.

In summary, after describing the different AIPAC tactics and their attempted efforts to influence governmental decision making, one can see that Mearsheimer and Walt are, for the most part, correct in their reasoning. After analyzing Mearsheimer and

---

[113] AIPAC, "The strategic value of Israel," 6 June 1983.

[114] Quote from an AIPAC promotional letter dated February 1982.

[115] O'Brian. 167.

[116] Ibid. 168.

[117] George W. Ball, The passionate attachment, (W.W. Norton & Company: New York1992): 214.

Walt's arguments with the additional independent analysis presented in the chapter, AIPAC does in fact have a very strong influence in Congress with their influential methods of voting, money, demonizing tactics, and their ability to manipulate U.S.-Israel strategic affairs. AIPAC, however, cannot yet be labeled "all powerful" as suggested by Mearsheimer and Walt. For AIPAC to be all powerful is to say that AIPAC alone can continue sway U.S.-Israel relations independent of additional pro-Israel forces. Mearsheimer and Walt did attempt to categorize all those pro-Israel forces as the "Israel Lobby," however, this cannot be the case in that there are many supporters of Israel that do not associate themselves with AIPAC or "the Lobby." That said, there is still a powerful pro-Israel force in American that could possibly be just as powerful as or more so than AIPAC. This force is known as the Evangelical Christians of America and will be the focus of the next chapter.

	Conventional Wisdom (CW)	**Mearsheimer and Walt (M&W)**	**Chapter 4 analysis**
Arguments w/ focus on AIPAC	1) Lobby is not all-powerful	Disagree w/CW- Lobby is all-powerful	Disagree w/M&W- Lobby is not all-powerful but very influential and persuasive
	2) Lobby has some influence in Congress	Disagree w/CW- Lobby manipulates congress w/ Jewish vote, money, & demonizing those who question Israel	Agree w/M&W- there are examples which confirm these arguments
	3) U.S.-Israel strategic relationship is not influence by Lobby	Disagree w/CW- U.S.-Israel strategic relationship is influenced by Lobby	Agree w/M&W- there are examples which confirm this argument

Figure 3. Arguments involving the Jewish "Israel Lobby" w/ focus on AIPAC

V. THE EVANGELICAL ARGUMENT

Mearsheimer and Walt were accurate in their assertion that AIPAC and Jewish Interest groups are influential with strategies involving voting, money, demonizing tactics, and the ability to intervene in U.S.-Israel strategic affairs. There is, however, one more pro-Israel group that Mearsheimer and Walt failed recognize as an independent lobbying force. This group is known as the evangelical Christians of America. Mearsheimer and Walt did mention "evangelicals" as a part of the so-called "Israel Lobby;" however, they also categorized everyone that is pro-Israel as part of the Lobby. By labeling everyone who is pro-Israel as a part of an all-powerful lobby creates an implausible argument. That said, the evangelical Christians of America have become a powerful and dominating pro-Israel force independent of AIPAC and other Jewish interest groups. Hence, the influences of evangelicals need to be analyzed before conclusions can be made that AIPAC is all powerful. This chapter will analyze the evangelical phenomenon by giving an overview of evangelicals in America, discuss evangelical reasoning for supporting Israel, and show the past influences and successes of American evangelicals.

A. OVERVIEW OF EVANGELICALS

Evangelicals are labeled as one of the three branches in American Protestantism which consist of fundamentalist, liberal, and evangelical. Unlike fundamentalists and evangelicals, liberal Protestantism does not focus its attention on classic biblical doctrine because they do not view all of the Bibles teachings as literal facts. For example, according to Walter Mead, liberal Christians do not believe "that Jesus was a supernatural being, but see him as a sublime moral teacher whose example they seek to follow through a lifetime of service-often directed primarily at the poor."[118] On the other hand, fundamentalists and evangelicals believe that the Bible is the inspired teachings of God and that all of the teachings within are seen as absolute truth. Fundamentalists and evangelicals, however, differ in terms of their involvement in society. As secularism

[118] Walter Russell Mead, "God's Country?," *Foreign Affairs,* (September/October 2006): 30.

progressed in America in the 20th century, fundamentalists began to withdraw from society to include both political and cultural arenas. Evangelicals, however, took the opposite approach and became more involved in mainstream American culture with a heavy involvement in politics.

Evangelical influence on the American body politic is by no means a new phenomenon. Their involvement in politics can date back to the 19th century during the protestant revivalist movement. The first evangelical involvement occurred in 1881 when William Blackstone, a well-known figure in American Zionism, gathered 43 signatures of key political figures to petition an effort to form a Jewish state in Palestine.[119] These efforts, although not seen as overwhelmingly influential, continued until 1948 when the Jewish state was born. One would assume that birth of Israel would have sparked an evangelical political movement; however, evangelicals were not a dominating political figure until the late 1970s and early 1980s. During this time period, Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin started to recognize the political clout evangelical leaders were obtaining on the U.S. government. During the first year of Begin's office, according to Phyllis Bennis, Prime Minister Begin instructed one of his aids to meet with prominent evangelical leaders in America to "explore the depth of their pro-Israel sentiment."[120] The feedback from the Israeli aid reported that the evangelical presence and influence on American politics was astounding.[121]

In the 1980s there was approximately 61 million Americans that followed the evangelical belief system.[122] One of the primary leaders that helped the rise of evangelicals in the 1980s was Dr. Jerry Falwell. Falwell was the founder of the "Moral Majority" which contributed greatly to the election of president Ronald Reagan who practiced evangelical beliefs. Throughout the 1990s, the presence of American evangelicals remained strong and continued to rise in number. According to Valerie

---

[119] Phyllis Bennis and Khaled Mansour, "Praise God and Pass the Ammunition," *Middle East Report*, (Fall 1998): 16.

[120] Bennis and Mansour, 17.

[121] Ibid. 17.

[122] Edward Tivnan, *The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987): 181.

Saturen, "at the beginning of the Gulf War, 14% of Americans believed they were witnessing the beginning of Armageddon."[123] To help bolster this belief system, popular novels and movies pertaining to the Christian view of the apocalypse were being sold by the millions. In the late 1990s, particular novels, known as the *Left Behind* series, sold over 50 million copies. According to Rammy Haija, "The *Left Behind* series depicts scenarios of the 'rapture' and all of the chaos that ensues once the true believers of Christ have absconded to heaven and the remaining non-believers are left on earth."[124] Throughout the nineties as evangelical slogans were flooding America, evangelical followers continued to increase in number. After the attacks of 9-ll, the number of evangelicals and their support for Israel increased even more with the "War on Terror" and the battle of good vs. evil.

Prior to 9-11, 41 percent of Protestants identified themselves as evangelical, however, in 2003, the number rose to 54 percent.[125] In addition, the Southern Baptist Convention, which shares the evangelical belief system, gained approximately 7 million additional members in the post 9-11 era.[126] Support for Israel also has increased quite significantly. According to the Pew forum on Religion and Public Life, as of 2006 "42 percent of Americans believed Israel was given to the Jewish people by God while 35 % said they believed the state of Israel was part of fulfillment of biblical prophecy about the second coming of Jesus."[127] In 2004, 40 percent of the total vote that elected President Bush for a second term came from evangelical Christians.[128] Although the evangelical movement has been on the rise since the 1970's, the post 9-11 era shows that evangelical's now represent 40 percent of America which is the highest number yet.[129]

---

[123] Valerie Saturen, "The Other Zionist Conpiracy: A History of Christian Zionism," *The Late Great Planet Earth* (February 06): 2.

[124] Rammy M. Haiga, "The Armageddon Lobby: Dispensationalist Christian Zionism and the Shaping of U.S. Policy towards Israel-Palestine," *Project Muse* (2006): 83.

[125] Mead, 36.

[126] Ibid

[127] Andrew Kohut, "Religion and Politics: Contention and Consensus," *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life* (2003): 3.

[128] Mead, 36.

[129] "Defining Evangelicalism," *Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals* (April 2005): http://www.wheaton.edu/isae/defining_evangelicalism.html. Last accessed October/2007.

B. EVANGELICAL REASONING FOR SUPPORTING ISRAEL

The continuous rise of evangelicals in the United States is not an accident, according to evangelicals. In the evangelical view, there has been phenomenal events that have taken place in the modern era that can give reason to the rise in evangelicals. These particular events involve the relationship between fulfilled biblical prophecy and the state of Israel. Not all, but the majority of evangelicals believe that the re-birth of Israel in 1948 was foretold in the Bible over 2000 years before it happened.

Over 2,000 years ago, according to evangelicals, there were prophetic themes recorded in the *Old Testament* portion of the Bible. When these prophecies were written, the Jewish people or Israelites still inhabited the land of Israel. There are three particular prophecies which are of great significance to the evangelical belief system. The first involves two covenantal promises God made to the Jewish people regarding Jewish decedents and the land of Israel. The first covenant from God to the Jews was that the Jewish people would last forever.

Psalm 89:33-37 reads

> I will not break off my loving kindness from him, nor deal falsely in my faithfulness. My covenant I will not violate, nor will I alter the utterance of my lips. Once I have sworn by my holiness; I will not lie to David. His descendants shall endure forever like the moon, and the witness in the sky is faithful.

Jeremiah 31:35-36 reads

> This is what the Lord says, he who appoints the sun to shine by day, who decrees the moon and stars to shine by night, who stirs up the sea so that its waves roar- the Lord almighty is his name: Only if these ordinances vanish from my sight, declares the Lord, will the descendants of Israel ever cease to be a nation before me.

The second promise to the Jewish people concerns the Land of Israel. This particular covenant was made from God to Abraham while he and his people were residing in Israel.

Genesis 13:14-15 reads

> And the Lord said unto Abram…lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: All the land which thou seest, to thee I give it, and to thy seed forever.

Genesis 15:18 reads

> In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, unto thy seed have I given this Land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates…

Psalm 105:11 reads

> Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance.

According to evangelicals, these two covenants are the core of the evangelical belief system. Evangelicals assert that the first covenant is significant considering the numerous occasions Jewish existence has been threatened. The second covenant, according to evangelicals, is why the land of Israel belongs to no other body of people other than the Jews. According to Rev. John Hagee, the evangelical belief system does not encourage any form of settlement between Palestine and Israel.[130] In fact, on every occurrence that Israel's land has been threatened, Hagee and his evangelical followers have formally protested the president and many congressional officials to discourage any form of settlement.

The second prophetic theme in the *Old Testament* is that God would re-establish the nation of Israel and then return its people from all over the world.

Isaiah 66:8 reads

> Who has ever heard of such a thing? Who has even seen such things? Can a country be born in a day or a nation be brought forth in a moment? Yet no sooner is Zion in labor, than she gives birth to her children.

Ezekiel 37:12 &14 reads

> This is what the sovereign Lord says: O My people, I am going to open your graves and bring you up from them; I will bring you back to the land of Israel… and will settle you in your own land.

Isaiah 11: 11 reads

> And He will set up an ensign for the nations, and will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

The evangelical belief system argues that these scriptures were fulfilled after World War two and the events of the Holocaust. According to Clarence Wagner, "a miracle took place and God did raise them up, literally out of their graves, and made them into a nation once again. On May 14, 1948, the modern state of Israel was born in a day."[131] In regards to the Isaiah scripture, according to Wagner, this prophecy was fulfilled in that the Jewish people have immigrated to Israel from over 100 countries.[132] In addition, certain evangelicals, such as Dr. Peter Gammons, argue that the Bible foretold, to the exact year, the surrender of Jerusalem from Turkish occupation on December 9, 1917.

Daniel 12:12 reads

> Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

---

[130] Terry Gross, "Pastor John Hagee discusses his foundation Christians United for Israel and his beliefs for the last days," *Fresh Air* (September, 18, 2006): 1.

[131] Clarence H. Wagner, *Israel in Prophecy Today* (Bridges for Peace International: United States 2002): 13.

[132] Ibid., 14.

The number 1335 is significant to evangelicals in that it supposedly represents the modern year of 1917. Peter Gammons, who is a well known biblical scholar, believes that the "days" mentioned in verse 12 are in fact years.[133] His reasoning stems from the "year for a day" philosophy mentioned in Ezekiel 4:6 which reads, "…I have appointed thee each day for a year." If the days are replaced by years then, according to the Muslim calendar, the year of 1335 is equivalent to the year 1917. According to Gammons, this date represents, not the establishment of Israel as a state, but the first step in the "liberation of Israel's land.[134]

The third prophetic them of the evangelical belief system is that God will use Gentile nations to bless Israel and that Jerusalem and the nation of Israel will never again cease to exist as a Jewish homeland. In this case, evangelicals see America as a "Gentile nation" which is, according to biblical scriptures, a nation obligated to support Israel. In addition, evangelicals also preach unconditional support to Israel because without Israel and the Jews, there would be no Bible or Christian faith; hence, the obligation for support.

Genesis 12:3 reads

> And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

Isaiah 60:10-12 reads

> And the sons of strangers shall build up they walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee…that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.

Romans 15:27 reads

> For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their (Israel) spiritual things, their (Gentiles) duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.

---

[133] Peter Gammons, *Israel in Prophecy: the Miracle of Zion* (Peter Gammons: 1992): 19.

[134] Ibid.

Evangelicals believe that America must do everything in its power to support the nation of Israel. The scriptures above are taken seriously by evangelicals because they believe America is a great nation only because of its continuous high levels of support to Israel. If America ever stopped supporting Israel, evangelicals strongly believe that God will curse America as he has those nations that have gone against Israel. According to Peter Gammons, God's blessing and prospering of the United States has been a direct result of her welcoming Israel more than any other nation.[135]

The evangelical belief system is no longer only a faith based conviction. They firmly believe that the world is currently witnessing fulfilled biblical prophecy which further motivates and intensifies the evangelical faith. Critics of evangelicals argue that biblical prophecies do not apply to Israel today. "Rather, they say all of these prophecies were fulfilled when the Jewish people returned from the Babylonian exile in the 6th century BC."[136] Evangelicals refute this allegation with Amos 9:15 which says that once Israel returns to their land, "they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." According to Evangelicals, since the Jews were pulled from their land after the Babylonian exile, the prophecy could not have been during that era. Now that the Jews are currently in the land of Israel, evangelicals argue that the prophecy applies to today and that Jews will never be driven from the land again.

C. PAST INFLUENCES AND SUCCESSES

The Evangelical Christians of America started to become exceptionally influential in politics through their recognized evangelical leaders. During the 1980s, the increase of evangelical involvement in politics ignited primarily because of Dr. Jerry Falwell. Dr. Falwell founded the moral majority in the 1979. His intent was to not only increase evangelical involvement in politics but unite a new wave of support for Israel. Dr. Falwell accomplished this task by uniting the evangelical vote in 1981 which greatly assisted in electing Ronald Regan as President. Once President Regan came into office, Dr. Falwell and the moral majorities' primary mission was to keep the Regan

[135] Gammons, 42.

[136] Wagner, 31.

administration pro-Israel. Because of Dr. Falwell and the moral majorities' political influences, the Regan administration is now looked at as one of the most pro-Israel administrations in U.S. history. In fact, because of Dr. Falwell's influences, Israeli Prime Minister Begin awarded Falwell with the Jabotinsky Centennial Medal for his achievements.[137] According to Haija, the medal is awarded to a person who is considered a lifetime friend of Israel.[138]

Another influential leader of the evangelical movement is Pastor John Hagee. Hagee witnessed how Dr. Falwell united the evangelical front in the 1980s and used that motivation to continue the movement throughout the 1990s and into the present day. Pastor Hagee is the pastor of an 18,000 member evangelical church who has written numerous best sellers such as "Jerusalem Countdown" and "Epicenter." Hagee is most currently well-known for the founding of the pro-Israel group called Christians United for Christ (CUFC). The CUFC was founded in February 2006 and has already united an annual lobbying effort in Washington, which in 2007; united 4500 evangelical leaders lobbying Congress on behave of Israel. According to Hagee, every time the CUFC has met with Congress, every congressional member was glad to receive the group.[139]

Because evangelical leaders, such as Falwell and Hagee, are exceptionally influential in their ability to unite pro-Israel movements, their successes in the American political arenas have been a common occurrence. Although evangelicals have had many small scale political successes regarding Israel, there are three particular examples which clearly portray the power of evangelicals in accordance with U.S. policy. The first example showing the power of evangelicals occurred after a Palestinian suicide attack in Israel in 2002. Following the attack, Israeli forces invaded many areas in the West Bank attempting to rid the area of terrorist attackers. The international community viewed Israel's actions as hostile and urged President Bush to intervene. President Bush responded and asked Prime Minister Sharon to stop the offensive. According to Haija, Sharon was prepared to halt the offensive until the Christian right involved themselves in

[137] Bennis, 2.

[138] Haija, 77.

[139] Gross, 6.

the situation.[140] Wagner wrote that evangelicals "mobilized over 100,000 e-mail messages, calls and visits urging the President to avoid restraining Israel. The tactic worked. The president uttered not another word of criticism or caution, and Sharon continued the offensive."[141]

The second evangelical success came in 2003 with the resignation of Congressman Jim Moran. When the United States military invaded Iraq in 2003, Moran argued that it was the interests of Israel and the Jewish Lobby that influenced the decision to invaded Iraq. Jewish interests groups immediately took offence to Moran's comments and demanded his resignation. After continued attempts by the Jewish community to get Moran's resignation, they were still unsuccessful. Soon after, Rev. Paul Schenck became involved and organized a powerful evangelical front condemning Moran's actions. After evangelical pressures, Moran suffered a loss of confidence from his party and quickly resigned.[142]

The third evangelical success occurred June 2003 when Israeli military forces tried to assassinate an important Hamas leader. Israeli forces were unsuccessful in their attempt and six Palestinian civilians were killed. President Bush, at the time, initially condemned the assassination attempt. However, once evangelicals heard the president's condemnation toward Israel, they once again united and stood firm in support of Israel. After numerous emails stating slogans such as, "the Christian voting bloc will not appear on election day," the president's attitude toward the Israel changed once again. In fact, the very next year when Israel assassinated Hamas' leader Shaykh Ahmad Yassin, the president supported the attack with little hesitation.[143]

In conclusion, the evangelical relationship to Israel is unique in that evangelicals give unconditional support to Israel no matter what the circumstances may be. Their reasoning stems from a deeply rooted theological belief that Israel's presence is a prelude

---

[140] Haija, 90.

[141] Donald Wagner, "Marching to Zion: The evangelical-Jewish Alliance," *Christian Century* (June 2003): 24.

[142] Paul Schenck, "Moran Levies Blood Libel against Jews," at: http://www.faithandaction.org Last accessed, October/2007.

[143] Stephen Zunes, "US Defense of Israeli Assassinations is Counterproductive," at: http://www.antiwar.com Last accessed, October/2007.

to the second coming of Christ. Thus, any enemy of Israel is an enemy of American evangelicals; hence, Jewish interest groups are befriended by evangelicals. The evangelical movement is increasing and will continue to influence governmental decision making as long as Israel exists.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VI. CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this thesis is to determine if American evangelicals are a sufficient condition for continued U.S. support to Israel. The dependent variable (DV) is represented by the overall outcome of U.S. support for Israel as a state. The independent variable (IV) is the level of support from the Evangelical Christian movement for Israel. To test the causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables this thesis first analyzed three additional areas of support that could potentially explain U.S. support to Israel consisting of moral reasoning, strategic reasoning, and Jewish lobbying efforts. After the analysis of the three areas was completed, this thesis analyzed the evangelical argument to see if it was a sufficient condition, independent of other supporting efforts, for continued U.S. support to Israel.

A. MORAL ARGUMENT

Mearsheimer and Walt claim that the moral case for Israeli support is "dwindling" and that the conventional wisdom is no longer relevant for U.S. support to Israel. According to Mearsheimer and Walt, the conventional wisdom regarding the moral case for supporting Israel, consists of four beliefs: "1) It is weak and surrounded by enemies, 2) it is a democracy, which is a morally preferable form of government; 3) the Jewish people have suffered from past crimes and therefore deserve special treatment, and 4) Israel's conduct has been morally superior to its adversaries' behavior."[144] Mearsheimer and Walt suggest that these four conventional reasons no longer justify moral reasoning for U.S. support to Israel. After analyzing Mearsheimer and Walt's arguments against the conventional belief system, this thesis found that Mearsheimer and Walt were correct in their reasoning regarding three of the four beliefs. The one area where they were slightly erroneous was their allegation that past crimes during the Holocaust are not sufficient for continuing U.S. support to Israel. To counter their assertion, this thesis conducted an in-depth analysis on the surrounding events of the Holocaust to find if the moral reasoning from the Holocaust is a sufficient condition for U.S. support to Israel. This thesis found

[144] Mearsheimer, 8-13.

that the events of the Holocaust did in fact have a significant impact on America's view towards Israel. Over the years, the memory of the Holocaust ignited and continued a moral compulsion among the American populous which further instilled and continued a moral responsibility for supporting Israel.

B. STRATEGIC ARGUMENT

Regarding the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel, Mearsheimer and Walt again argue against the conventional views of America. The conventional wisdom suggests that 1) Israel is a strategic asset (both past and present), 2) Israel and U.S. share the same enemy, 3) U.S.-Israel relations do not encourage terrorism, and 4) Israel is a loyal ally. Mearsheimer and Walt did recognize Israel's past strategic successes but questioned how beneficial those successes were to the United States. After analyzing the four claims made by Mearsheimer and Walt, this thesis found that Mearsheimer and Walt were incorrect on three of the four arguments. By giving proper historical account of Israel's past successes, this thesis showed that Israel was in fact strategically beneficial to the United States. Secondly, this thesis argued that Israel and the United States do share the same enemy by showing the interconnectedness of Hezbollah and Iran which both target Israel and the United states. The third conventional view that Mearsheimer and Walt disputed was plausible in that as long as the United States and Israel remain allies, terrorism from radical Islam will follow in suit given its vow to destroy the Jewish state and those who support it. Lastly, Israel was proven to be a loyal ally by weighing the past benefits against Israel as a burden. This thesis found the because Israel offers overwhelmingly more benefits than burdens to the United States, the Jewish state will continue to be viewed as a loyal ally.

C. THE JEWISH "ISRAEL LOBBY"

Mearsheimer and Walt argue that the explanation for U.S. support to Israel "lies in the unmatched power to the Israel Lobby" and if it were "not for the Lobby's ability to manipulate the American political system, the relationship between Israel and the U.S.

would be far less intimate."[145] Furthermore they define the core of the Lobby to be "compromised of American Jews who make a significant effort in their daily lives to bend U.S. foreign policy so that is advances Israel's interests."[146] To discover if Mearsheimer and Walt's argument showed sufficient or necessary causation, this thesis analyzed the influences and effectiveness of AIPAC on Congress and U.S. foreign policy. This thesis found the AIPAC does in fact have the ability to manipulate congressional voting with its Jewish constituency, money, and demonizing tactics. In addition, this thesis found that the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel greatly influenced by AIPAC and other Jewish interest groups. In short, Mearsheimer and Walt were partially correct in their reasoning. Jewish interest groups do obtain enormous power and influence within Congress. However, because there is an additional pro-Israel force independent of AIPAC, AIPAC alone cannot be a necessary condition for U.S. support to Israel. AIPAC is, however, a sufficient reason for Israeli support.

D. THE EVANGELICAL ARGUMENTS

Since the 1970s, evangelical Christians have become a dominating pro-Israel force independent of AIPAC and other Jewish interest groups. Mearsheimer and Walt did recognize evangelicals as a pro-Israel interest group but failed to identify the magnitude and political clout the group possesses independent of AIPAC. In the beginning of Mearsheimer and Walt's article, they stated that the "Israel Lobby" primarily consisted of AIPAC and other Jewish interest groups which significantly impact Congress and policy towards Israel. This argument, by itself, is sufficient; however, as Mearsheimer and Walt's article concluded, they categorized everyone that supported Israel as a part of the "Israel Lobby" which together manipulates foreign policy. This particular argument is insufficient in that not all supporters of Israel affect or have any relationship to U.S. policy. In fact, many supporters of Israel want nothing to do with AIPAC or any other Israeli interest group lobbying on behave of Israel. That said, this thesis attempted to discover if American evangelicals are a sufficient condition, independent of AIPAC, for

[145] Mearsheimer, 14.

[146] Ibid.

the continuation of U.S. support to Israel. To accomplish this task, this thesis analyzed the evangelical phenomenon by giving an overview of evangelicals in America, discussing the evangelical reasoning for supporting Israel, and showing the past influences and successes of American evangelicals. The analysis showed that the evangelical movement in America is on the rise and succeeding as an independent lobbying force for Israel. Based on fulfilled Biblical prophecy, evangelicals give unconditional support to Israel no matter what the conditions may be. The evangelical influence on past presidents and congressional members has been successful on numerous occasions regarding Israel. Because the moral, strategic, and domestic political reason's are all together aspects that continue to promote Israeli support, the evangelical argument cannot by itself account for the continuation of U.S. support to Israel. It is, however, a sufficient condition, along with the other influential reasons, for continuing the U.S.-Israel relationship.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Ball, George W. 1992. The passionate attachment. W.W. Norton & Company: New York.

Ben-ZVI, Abraham. 2004. *Lyndon B. Johnson and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*. Portland, OR: Frank Class.

Cloud, David S. 2006. Inquiry opened into Israeli use of U.S. bombs. *New York Times*.

Cooley, John K. 2005. *An Alliance Against Babylon;\: The US, Israel, and Iraq*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Davis, Kenneth S. 1993. *FDR: Into the Storm.* New York).

Dinnerstein, Leonard. 1982. *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust.* Columbia University Press: New York.

Edward Tivnan. 1987. *The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Finzi, Roberto. 1999. *Anti-Semitism: from its European roots to the Holocaust*. Interlink Publishing Group: New York.

Fleischmann, Ellen. 1989. Image and Issues and the AIPAC Conference. Journal of Palestine Studies.

Gammons Peter. 1992. *Israel in Prophecy: the Miracle of Zion.* Peter Gammons Inc.

Gross, Terry. 2006. Pastor John Hagee discusses his foundation Christians United for Israel and his beliefs for the last days. Fresh Air.

Haiga, Rammy M. 2006. The Armageddon Lobby: Dispensationalist Christian Zionism and the Shaping of U.S. Policy towards Israel-Palestine. Project Muse.

Harnden, Toby. 2006. Three Iranian Factories Mass-Produce Bombs to Kill British In Iraq. London Sunday Telegraph.

Kohut Andrew. 2003. Religion and Politics: Contention and Consensus. The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life.

Kukis, Mark. 2007. Hezbollah's long reach into Iraq. Time Magazine.

Levey, Gregory. 2007. Inside America's powerful Israel Lobby. Salon Inc.

Laqueur, Walter. 1998. *The Terrible Secret*. Henry Holt and Company: New York.

Mansour, Camille. 1994. *Beyond Alliance: Israel in US Foreign Policy*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Maoz, Zeev. 2006. *Defending the Holy Land.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Mearsheimer, John J., Walt, Stephen M. 2006. The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy. London Review of Books.

Migdalovitz. Carol. 2006. Israel: Background and Relation with the United States. CRS Report for Congress.

Mintz, Alan. 2001. *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America.* University of Washington Press: Seattle and London.

Mordechai Gazit. 2000. The Genesis of the US-Israeli Military-Strategic Relationship and the Dimona Issue. Journal of Contemporary History.

Nelson, Nancy Jo. 1980. The Zionist Organizational Structure. Journal of Palestine Studies.

Novick, Peter. 2000. *The Holocaust in American Life.* Houghton Mifflin Company: New York.

O'brian, Lee. 1986. *American Jewish Organizations & Israel.* Institute for Palestine Studies: Washington D.C.

Organski. A.F. K. 1990. *The $36 Billion Bargain: Strategy and politics in U.S. assistance to Israel.* Columbia University Press: New York.

Phyllis Bennis and Khaled Mansour. 1998. Praise God and Pass the Ammunition. Middle East Report.

Safran, Nadav. 1978. *Israel The Embattled Ally*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Saturen Valerie. 2006. The Other Zionist Conpiracy: A History of Christian Zionism. The Late Great Planet Earth.

Wagner, Donald. 2003. Marching to Zion: The evangelical-Jewish Alliance. Christian Century.

Wagner, Clarence H. 2002. *Israel in Prophecy Today.* Bridges for Peace International: United States.

Walter Russell Mead. 2006. God's Country? Foreign Affairs.

Wyman, David S. 1984. *The Abandonment of the Jews.* Pantheo Books: New York.

Zunes, Stephen. 2006. The Israel Lobby: How Powerful is it Really*? FPIF*.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
   Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

2. Dudley Knox Library
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

3. Professor James Wirtz
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Department of National Security Affairs
   Monterey, California

4. Professor Michael E. Freeman
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Department of Defense Analysis
   Monterey, California

5. Professor Douglas Porch
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs
   Monterey, Californiaf